

Summer 1937

Connecticut College Alumnae News Vol. 14 No. 4

Connecticut College

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.conncoll.edu/alumnews>

Recommended Citation

Connecticut College, "Connecticut College Alumnae News Vol. 14 No. 4" (1937). *Alumni News*. Paper 43.
<http://digitalcommons.conncoll.edu/alumnews/43>

This Magazine is brought to you for free and open access by the Linda Lear Center for Special Collections & Archives at Digital Commons @ Connecticut College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Alumni News by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Connecticut College.

For more information, please contact bpancier@conncoll.edu.

The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author.

PALMER LIBRARY
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE
NEW LONDON, CONN.

CONNECTICUT COLLEGE ALUMNAE NEWS



published by

1937

ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION OF
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE

Connecticut College Alumnae News

VOL. XIV

SUMMER, 1937

NO. 4



Published four times a year in November, February, May, and August by the
Connecticut College Alumnae Association

Entered at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis., as second class matter

Subscription price, \$1.00 per year

Office of Publication: 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis.

Editorial and General Office: Fanning Hall, Connecticut College
New London, Conn.

Editor-in-Chief

ESTHER TYLER, '33, Noroton Heights, Conn.

Managing Editor: KATHRYN MOSS '24

Alumnae Office, Fanning Hall,
Connecticut College, New London, Conn.

Business Manager:

MILLICENT WAGHORN, '34
156 Collins St., Hartford, Conn.

Assistant Editors:

JULINE WARNER COMSTOCK '19
176 Highwood Ave., Leonia, N.J.

ERNESTINE HERMAN, '34
3750 Lake Shore Dr., Chicago, Ill.

RUTH WORTHINGTON, '35
214 Monroe St., Hartford, Conn.

OFFICERS of the CONNECTICUT COLLEGE ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION

President

JANET CRAWFORD HOW, '24
96 Meadowbrook Rd., West Hartford, Conn.

First Vice-President

ALICE HORRAX SCHELL, '20
7 Ridgewood Ter., Maplewood, N.J.

Second Vice-President

RUTH FERREE, '33
22 Lexington Rd., West Hartford, Conn.

Recording Secretary

MARJORIE NICHOLSON, '35
107 Foster Ave., Mount Vernon, N.Y.

Treasurer

ELIZABETH HARTSHORN, '30
Connecticut College, New London, Conn.

Chairman of Nominating Committee

ELIZABETH GALLUP RIDLEY
36 Cherry St., North Adams, Mass.

Editor of the News

ESTHER TYLER, '33

Counsellors

VIRGINIA EGGLESTON SMITH, '24
3565 Normandy Rd., Shaker Heights, Ohio

A. PARKS MCCOMBS, '25
10 Mitchell Pl., New York City

ALYS GRISWOLD, '36
Old Lyme, Conn.

Trustees

AGNES LEAHY, '21
222 E. 57th St., New York City

MARENDIA PRENTIS, '19
98 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass.

ROSAMOND BEEBE, '26
51 S. Park St., Montclair, N.J.

Executive Secretary

KATHRYN MOSS, '24

Connecticut College Alumnae News

Vol. XIV

No. 4



Summer

1937

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

BY DR. MARION EDWARDS PARK, BRYN MAWR

WHEN President Blunt asked me to speak at these commencement exercises I was keen to accept her invitation. I am proud to take part in the great day of a college for which I have so much liking and, still better, so much respect. But such a summons has its black as well as its bright side. A commencement audience is not an easy one-piece affair but a composite which baffles a speaker. It gathers in the graduates of today and their predecessors, the graduates of yesterday, the families who have produced them, the teachers who have devised the work, taught it and then estimated in the registrar's office how thoroughly it has been remembered or how boldly it has been forgotten, the small group who administer the financial affairs and the policies of the college and keep it a going concern, and probably some neighbors and unconnected well-wishers thrown in. This complication I shall not recognize. I shall make a courtesy bow to all these trustees, neighbors, faculty, parents and alumnae, and speak directly to those students themselves in whose honor we have met and to whose ritual we have listened.

And I should like to discuss with you not your futures, but mainly your pasts, those pasts whose door you technically closed ten minutes ago—to say to you a little of what has been boiling up in my own mind this winter about the four years' training you and many other young women have just put to

trial. Never again will your education be so fresh in your mind, or you so ready to attack or defend it. And I can well afford to pass over everyone else in your favor, because though you are the Class of 1937 of today you are all potentially and some will be actually the trustees, the faculty, the parents and the alumnae of the next twenty-five years.

It is nothing new in the history of the processes of civilization to have a new group filter into and use an old process; and nothing new to find that the process is used by the newcomers for some time without any thought of change from the form in which it has been standardized. But later on if the new group increases in numbers and consequently more attention and interest gathers around it, if again the new group becomes not only larger, but different in character, more varied in its powers and in its purposes and so makes more demands on the old routine, then the question of the fit between the new group and the old process which at first was used without question rises to the surface. The education of women is a good example.

About 75 years ago colleges for women began to filter into an old educational process, the liberal arts curriculum, worked out so far for men only. They did it, speaking generally, in one of two ways. Some women's colleges started in without any definitely feminist point of view. As a matter of course they set up the curriculum and method which colleges for men had tried and found satisfac-

tory. Some of them on the other hand with clenched teeth took over deliberately every dull detail with a melodramatic purpose; to prove at once and to prove forever that women could match men intellectually. But both approaches, the natural use of the familiar formulæ and the dogged experiment, had the same result for the women students; masculine education was everywhere repeated for the ladies.

I want to speak to you briefly and so quite superficially today about this, about the man's curriculum in the woman's college, for with 75 years or more of history behind us our curricula are in general still not different from those of the men's colleges; the sex of a college catalog could hardly be determined by a blind-folded investigator, even a registrar.

Yet enough time has passed over our heads to give us illuminating experience and perhaps some new points of view. In 1937 Bryn Mawr and Connecticut neither need to slip along unobtrusively in an imitation curriculum nor to prove, hammer and tongs, that we can carry it. Important ground-work has changed, too. The group of men, for instance, which is studying in liberal arts colleges is itself increased numerically and has become much more diversified. So has the women's group which now prepares itself not almost exclusively for the teaching profession but for a variety of ends. And finally side by side with the separate colleges for women co-education has risen and been widely adopted, a development which on the surface might seem to be a sufficient answer to all my coming questions, but which isn't actually as I shall develop in my next commencement speech.

This one, however, appropriately to this college and this speaker, is limited to the problem in the separate colleges for women. Are there reasons for continuing to borrow the curriculum of colleges for men? If not in toto where shall the borrowing be replaced by our own material and method? Or ought we to think of our education in wholly new terms? Our borrowings have certainly brought us where we are but some investigation of them in cold blood by a class which

has just finished a four year trial of them is justified on one hand and can do no harm on the other. I regret the investigation for conventional reasons is a monologue and not a free for all discussion.

For some of you these questions are already answered. Men and women alike who wish to prepare for the professional school and a later professional career must take from the general bill of fare the preliminary training which you both need and which is identical for both. We need only say in passing that the women's group here is still smaller and less varied than the men's. And for some among you the question is not worth much discussion. You have used the liberal arts curriculum for no very clear purpose and have even successfully got your A.B. degree without reasoning why! And we should hazard a guess in passing that this women's group is again, and here fortunately, smaller than the men's. But some of you and by far the largest number have used the curriculum to build up a richer kind of life for yourselves and (though you are not likely to announce it when a college president is listening) to make your decent contribution to the good of society, to civilization, to America, to the kingdom of Heaven on earth—whatever you choose to call it. In the women's colleges this group is very numerous and I hope I shall make clear that its problems are peculiarly in need of foresight and forethought. They are exceedingly difficult and their solution is exceedingly important to society. I shall speak as though it included you all.

You then, the class of 1937 at Connecticut College who, confess it or not, have come with some seriousness and interest to get for yourselves a more varied and interesting life and to make to the civilization into which you were born a contribution which is satisfactory to yourselves—you look up with a healthy appetite to a man-made, woman-used curriculum. If you have still any feeling of hunger as students occasionally have, let us discuss alternatives. The most radical first.

Should women's colleges think of your education in wholly new terms, begin to offer

you wholly new wares from their counters? This has an implication which cuts to the bone. It would be to agree to inborn, essential differences between men and women only to be met by different educations built on different foundations. There have certainly been many anthropologists and many laymen, many legal systems, much religion, much tradition, many parents attempting to establish such inborn essential differences. Don't forget that as we sit here it is a widely used contemporary theory. On such anthropology the present National-Socialist and Fascist governments base their policies in the use of the man and the woman citizen. But apparently the younger and perhaps the most sound anthropologists, Frank Boas' students, to mention names, are now leaning toward the opposite hypothesis; they argue that the so-called sex differences of conduct are the result of social suggestion and standardization which though it varies with varying patterns of culture occurs almost universally.

Dr. Margaret Mead finds, for instance, that one New Guinea tribe isolated from the rest of the world indoctrinates men and women equally to coöperation, gentleness, responsiveness to the needs of others, especially children; another equally independent of contacts trains both sexes to aggression, violence, ruthlessness, the women as regardless of the children as the men. Still a third presses its younger generations into two different molds as we do, but makes the boys gentle and emotionally independent and the women aggressive and dominating. Dr. Mead and her readers naturally conclude these different aspects of behavior cannot actually be tied up with sex at all. And she proceeds to carry the argument into European-American sex traditions and standards. Sidney Smith has been there before her: "As long as boys and girls run about in the dirt, and trundle hoops together, they are both precisely alike. If you catch up one half of these creatures, and train them to a particular set of actions and opinions, and the other half to a perfectly opposite set, of course their understandings will differ, as one or the other sort of occupations has called

this or that talent into action. There is surely no occasion to go into any deeper or more abstruse reasoning, in order to explain so very simple a phenomenon."

If Dr. Mead and Sidney Smith are right, American men and women of 1937 differ because our society has agreed to indoctrinate each with the idea that men take by nature certain attitudes and women certain attitudes; that the man's attitudes are, say, enterprise, initiative, fearlessness, and the woman's regard for personal relations, care for human life, emotional responsiveness.

Two things seem reasonably clear to anyone pondering on the results of this indoctrination which we only half-recognize: first, that even in its milder forms, not in Germany but in New London, it must cramp the individual man or woman at every point where he or she varies from the arbitrary man- or woman-pattern, and second, that the whole texture of our society might be richer if we did not think in two great formalized groups, but instead merely as human individuals able to develop in any possible directions for which we have the purposes and abilities.

For women, frankly the hypothesis that apparent, general differences in mind and character between men and women are not fundamental or final is not only refreshing but experimentation with it seems essential, for society except in an occasional New Guinea tribe has often doomed us to the more limited and duller of the two patterns. And if we are free to work along it at least until we know more than we know now, it may be that not only women but society in general may profit.

This is actually the hypothesis by which women's colleges exist at all. We must remember that they were, and indeed still are not merely a project for the education of more people but a lively protest against being treated differently from men, the rise of a social institution which deliberately tries to lessen sex distinctions and, however indirectly, persuade the world to deal with two norms only, one an individual human being and the other an undivided human group.

Should we not agree then to act on it, say for another hundred year experiment to keep the idea of any curriculum which by and large serves the purposes of both men and women, not trying to train you as standardized females on a new plan of our own but as human individuals on a plan which includes your brother and you?

This answer to our question is not merely an airy agreement; it has many practical implications, though they are more often a widening out of what we are doing than a creation of something new. It means among much else the presence on our faculties of both men and women so that you shall see for yourselves that the teacher's, the scholar's life in this class room differs from the teacher's and scholar's life as the individual, not as the sex differs. It means unselfconscious work-a-day relations with young men comparable to unselfconscious work-a-day relations between young women. It means the widest possible range of development for the individual woman. It means especially the encouragement of and assistance to the young woman who wants to leave her pattern, attack a new field, try a new job. Again, where the results of such indoctrinations face us in docility, for example, (I am quoting the abstractions men throw at us), in the lack of objectivity in opinion, in poor coöperation, in intellectual timidity—the woman's college must place counter-emphasis on initiative, on give-and-take relations between individuals, in families, communities, and nations, on seriousness, and on the courage on which truth and liberty must rest.

Now the second of our questions. Grant that the ends of women's education are the same as men's because you the students, the individuals, are essentially the same, and that the women's colleges would retrogress from a well-defended position if they revolted wholly from their inherited curriculum—do the academic problems of Connecticut and Bryn Mawr differ in no wise from those which Amherst and Yale also face? Do any details need our special attention? Do we need any special material or method? The

answer of the modern watchman on the tower must be "yes." You are the victims of biology. The ends, personal and social, to attain which the woman comes to college, are also the man's but there is a clear difference in the pattern which the woman's life is likely to take. The professional woman, for example, will meet not only the normal discouragement and difficulty of her profession of medicine, law, architecture, or teaching, but additional problems because her place in those professions is more lightly regarded by the community than the man's. She must work harder for success and the fields of success for her are narrowed. This has been thrown in relief in the last years and needs no elaboration. I wish that her general, if not her professional education were providing her with some stabilizing quality, some rational courage and patience, what not, to meet her special difficulties.

Now for the unprofessional majority. Though you will not be doctors or professors, you will often begin by holding paying positions, jobs of real importance and interest. You will be intelligent, competent, useful to your community. And with you marriage will occur in a high majority of cases. It will interfere with a unified individual life far more than in the case of your husbands. You have earned and will repay any assistance you can get. The college has, I think, two responsibilities if it looks to the pretty certain pattern of your lives. It must foresee along with you the special problems of the mother of children, and it must also foresee with you the general problem of the broken-in-on life, the life in which the important interests and responsibilities are not unified but are entirely different at different times.

First, for the mother's special problems. While she is bearing children and during the early years of their rearing she is meeting something totally unlike anything handed out by her earlier experience. I speak not as a wife and mother, but as an observant daughter, sister, and aunt. My female relatives have agreed that the ten to 15 years is an interesting experience—a good stretch but a hard

one. The woman is likely to have a good deal of physical discomfort and disability, and some sharp crises in childbirth, a good deal of confinement with immature human beings—"lumps of flesh" as Dr. Johnson tenderly calls them—a good deal of physical care, sudden demands for knowledge of complicated psychological information and a 24 hour a day responsibility month after month. The woman's college should, I believe, make as full, as authoritative, and as interesting as possible for you who have this ahead of you the content of certain common courses whose material will form a good basis for your needs. These courses include of course the biological and physical sciences, psychology and philosophy. A great deal of money should be spent on these in all women's colleges. The practical techniques of care, diet and nursing and the rest I think no college should spend a penny on! They change too fast to be a safe reliance and they can be acquired by an intelligent and sensible woman, even an aunt, with relative speed.

Second, the general problem, occurring among men but far more common among women, of preparation for a life in which the balance of interests and responsibilities swings to and fro. For a woman, a time of relatively independent experience will probably follow a time of absorbing attention to a family. This will later be rather suddenly replaced by a renewal of free time and free interest, but the preoccupation, the techniques, the profession, the training learned earlier will be rusty or out of date, and in many cases she will find it perplexing to resume the more independent direction of her life again. The college should look ahead to this situation, I believe, and provide and encourage you in some strong personal interest to which you may be able to return because its basis is so fully and soundly built up in your mind that it can survive a long break in your surface attention. This problem of giving a permanent, usable intellectual interest to you with the complicated demands and exigencies which we and you know you must meet is the single most difficult and most important

problem which the women's colleges face, in my judgment. We are making slow steps toward it. It is a great argument for honors courses, for a major system by whatever name it is called, in a woman's college, a major system with a full or rich content laid down by law. It is an argument again for presenting any kind of material to women students by methods which you can master and apply to your own intellectual interests later on when you find yourself unable to turn quickly to your old sources. It makes the budgeting of time important, the acquiring of intellectual exercises, of the use of books, discussion and certainly of the thinking, reasoning, weighing of judgment, anything which will keep you in relation to an old intellectual interest or enable you to take on new interests developing from it or balancing it.

This is not all. The residence and environment of the family will be more often selected with a view to your husband's interests and advantages than to yours, and yet in many cases you will have the greater responsibility for the family relations in the community. I think that the college which is training you with your future in mind should give you as much responsibility in its small community as possible without the protection from your failures or your mistakes, not only in the academic part of your college experience, but in its background of social life. It should have taken advantage of the smaller stage which the little compact community affords and the quick comeback of a group of outspoken contemporaries to give you a kind of rehearsal for your life in your own community. You need for this rehearsal from the college the utmost personal freedom which it can give, for it can be supervised profitably only at the start. You need to understand and yourself to discuss and criticize pro and con academic and administrative policies as they affect you. You need full swing in the management of every kind of activity into which you can enter and which I don't need to enumerate. Certain practical needs can conveniently be attained too if your family has failed to provide them. For by the way, and on the side some-

time, the college must try to give you some way of beginning to earn your living, though you are not going to be a professional woman. Long college holidays can be used for this, for some acquaintance with typewriting, account-keeping, with the various athletic and domestic and artistic skills which will be useful to you and in your community. And, last of all, the college itself should try to develop by its own example, by propaganda among its alumnae and its clientele the part-time job for salary or wages, and the responsible volunteer job, so that its earlier students returning to an outside interest or duty after absence from it shall find the first steps, and indeed the final outcome, not impossibly difficult.

What you have to say to all this I can't, unfortunately, stop to ask, but I hope some day I shall know. My own platform I shall put again in three sentences.

The general ends and outlines which the women's colleges have borrowed from their brothers should, I think, remain, or if they change, only change along with their models. But the woman student must have special help in adapting herself to her special pattern for which naturally the men who don't know it have not provided. Certain specific theory may help her when the wife and mother problems are most hectic. But her balance in the recovery will be best found and maintained, and she will be saved for immense use to the community, if the college helps her to

learn how to start and stop, forget and recall, break off and take up, pull herself out by her own bootstraps.

Let the women's colleges say a quick goodbye then to methods which inculcate dependence, like onerous lecture systems, or which scatter interest, like short, unconnected courses. Welcome to the major subject, the honors courses, anything which forces work at an advanced level, accustoms the young woman to some modicum of thinking, carries her experience forward into some knowledge of the complications, discouragements and powers of knowledge and of method. Goodbye to the regulation on freedom and the confining traditions which exist beyond the minimum democracy and common sense need. Goodbye to the gentlemen's C degree and any college red tape which establishes it as desirable, and welcome to any requirements for admission to college or for work there which bring maturity to birth and a civilized point of view. The colleges for men have sometimes turned out sophomores for life, and so have we, and our duty for the future is to make arrested development a less possible phenomenon. Welcome to experimentation, to the colleges who are trying it and the students who carry its practice beyond the little world they leave today. By putting together our grains of sand we may build for women and so for human society a better foundation on which to meet the future.

141 DEGREES CONFERRED

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE degrees were awarded at the 19th commencement exercises at Connecticut College this June. One hundred and thirty-seven of these were bachelor of arts degrees conferred upon the members of the class of 1937. Four were master of arts degrees awarded to graduate students in several fields.

The exercises were held in the quadrangle instead of the outdoor theater as planned because of the rainy weather.

The commencement speaker was Dr. Marian Edwards Park, president of Bryn Mawr

College. The degrees were conferred by President Katharine Blunt.

The exercises opened with an invocation by the Rev. Paul F. Laubenstein of the college faculty. The choir sang two selections under the direction of Dr. J. Lawrence Erb, after which Dr. Park delivered the commencement address. The choir again sang before the conferring of the degrees by President Blunt. Honors and prizes were announced following the conferring of the degrees.

Commencement honors were announced as follows:

WINTHROP SCHOLARS

Class of 1937—M. Louise Cook, Evelyn G. Miller, J. Blanche Mapes, Pearl Myland.

Class of 1938—Doris L. Bacon, Gladys E. Klippel, Marjorie P. Hanson, Anne Oppenheim.

FINAL HONORS

High honors—M. Louise Cook.

Honors—J. Blanche Mapes, Evelyn G. Miller, Pearl C. Myland, Elizabeth E. Schumann, Doris A. Wheeler.

DEPARTMENTAL HONORS

Chemistry—Elizabeth E. Murray.

Fine Arts—Ranice Birch.

German—Edith Agranovitch.

ANNUAL HONORS

Class of 1937—Edith I. Agranovitch, Evelyn G. Miller, Lucy Barrera, Elizabeth E. Murray, Virginia Belden, Pearl C. Myland, M.

Louise Cook, Elizabeth E. Schumann, Jane Flannery, Doris A. Wheeler.

Class of 1938—Doris L. Bacon, Myrtle Levine, Helen R. Feldman, May A. Nelson, Elizabeth M. Fielding, Winifred H. Nies, Marjorie P. Hanson, Anne Oppenheim, Gladys E. Klippel.

Class of 1939—Marjorie D. Abrahams, Thelma M. Gilkes, Clarinda M. Burr, Muriel Hall, Eunice M. Carmichael, Virginia Taber.

Class of 1940—Sybil P. Bindloss, Laeita Pollock, Miriam F. Brooks, Dorothy E. Rowand, Helen S. Burnham, Ruth Ward, Ruth A. Gill, E. Marguerite Whittaker, Florence J. McKemie.

The president then made her annual statement in which she outlined the progress of the college during the past year and described some of its plans and hopes for the future. A hymn followed by the benediction brought the exercises to a close.

M.A. DEGREE CONFERRED ON FOUR GRADUATE STUDENTS

THE degree of master of arts was conferred upon four graduate students at the Connecticut College commencement exercises this June.

Miss Jane L. Garrettson of Michigan City, Ind., received her degree in sociology. She was graduated from Smith College in 1933 and came to Connecticut College the following year as an assistant in the department of social science. She will remain at the college as an instructor in the same department next year.

Miss Jean L. Pennock of Philadelphia won her degree in history and political science. She graduated from Connecticut College in 1933 and devoted more than a year following her graduation to social service in Philadelphia.

She returned to Connecticut College as a graduate fellow and part-time assistant in history and political science in 1935.

Miss Beatrice Scheer of Rochelle Park, N.J., did research work in growth hormones for her degree. She graduated from Barnard College in 1934 and has been at Connecticut College as an assistant in botany for the past two and one-half years. Next year she will be a research assistant at the University of Michigan.

Miss Dorothy E. Lobb of Kansas City, Mo., received her degree in chemistry. She is a graduate of Wellesley College in the class of 1935. During the past two years she has been a graduate fellow and part-time assistant in chemistry at Connecticut College.

A NEW VENTURE

The Washington Chapter announces that it has gone into the magazine business, thereby furnishing harassed alumnae housewives the perfect excuse for turning down door to door solicitors. Subscriptions are handled by one of the leading magazine agencies in the country. Please send all your new subscriptions and renewals to: Virginia Stevenson, 3421 Newark Street, Washington, D.C. The proceeds will go to the Alumnae Association.

BACCALAUREATE SERMON

BY REV. DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH

BECAUSE the preacher was wise, he taught the people knowledge." Ecclesiastes 12:9, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," John 8:32,

It is commonly assumed that a baccalaureate sermon should have something to say about education and something about life. I shall make little use of either of these terms, yet I will not altogether ignore the presumable interest of my hearers in what those terms stand for. Addressing myself primarily to the members of the graduating class I may assume, I suppose, that having been exposed for most of your lives to the educational process you are at least mildly interested in what education has done and may yet do for you, whether you think of it as now finished or as only fairly begun.

But I am sure I may count upon your interest in life, an interest no longer merely mild but keen and vivid, in what its unfolding future may have in store and make possible for you in the way of experience and achievement. But instead of indulging in generalities about education and life, I will take science as involved in education and religion as an element of life, and ask you to consider once more something of what science and religion have meant and may yet mean to each other.

Science and religion in their mutual relations in the recent past and present exhibit a series of stages of progress which we may designate as the stage of conflict, the stage of conciliation, and the stage of coöperation. Roughly speaking, these three in the order given are characteristic of the past, the present and the future relations of science to religion and religion to science, although the stage of conflict cannot be said to be wholly past and the stage of coöperation may be recognized as having fairly begun.

The stage of conflict, so largely a matter of history, has been described in detail in books bearing such titles as "The Conflict Between Science and Religion," "A History of the Warfare Between Science and Theology, and

Landmarks in the Struggle Between Science and Religion." In this conflict science has seemed to religion to be the aggressor, and to be bent on the destruction of priceless traditional values. To men of science, on the other hand, the spokesmen of religion have seemed to be obstructing progress, not only in the gaining of knowledge of reality but also in the production of new practical values for humanity. In the early dawn of modern science the new astronomy cast doubt upon the church's traditional doctrine of heaven, hell, and purgatory, viewed as being essentially definite places rather than as possibilities of experience here and hereafter.

Such controversies as those concerned with the relation of Genesis to geology and especially to the evolution theory in biology tended to break down the traditional belief in a Bible miraculously preserved from all error in all its parts. Scientific historical criticism of traditional documents and dogmas undermined still further traditional external authority in religion. Psychology and the science of religion imposed further limits upon belief in the supernatural. Not a few began to say with the anthropologist Frazer, that as religion had displaced magic in the attempt to control nature, so it was to be expected that religion in turn would have to give way and eventually disappear before the rapid march of science. Not only was every claim of special revelation, past or present, viewed with scepticism; even the fundamental tenets of natural religion—God, freedom and immortality—were disputed in the name of science, empiricism and the universal reign of law.

Many teachers of science went so far in denying in the name of science beliefs which are fundamental not only to religion but to moral responsibility itself, that it is not strange that reaction was aroused or that it went to unjustified extreme. The papal condemnation of modernism and the fundamentalist movement among conservative Protestants were typical expressions of the most

unnatural alarm so widely felt. The campaign against the teaching of evolution, led by William Jennings Bryan and culminating in the famous Scopes trial, was motivated by fear of social consequences of the Nietzschean and supposedly Darwinian doctrine that racial progress can only be secured by means of a deliberate ruthless struggle for existence and the supposed consequent survival of the physically and mentally fittest. In the disastrous World War, it was claimed, the legitimate consequences of Darwinism were to be seen. The conservative reaction of scientifically uneducated—or unscientifically educated—men of religion against religiously indifferent teachers of science went to absurd and deplorable lengths, but in its original motivation it was not wholly without justification.

It should be noted, however, that the conflict generally referred to as the warfare between science and religion is not really that, but rather the strife caused either by men of science going beyond their own legitimate sphere and encroaching dogmatically upon the domain of religion or by a similar dogmatic trespassing of representatives of religion upon the legitimate territory of descriptive science. When the conservative theologian, in order to safeguard the belief in a God creatively at work in the universe, past and present, undertakes to deny some of the most surely established results and most reasonable and verifiable hypotheses of biological, psychological and sociological science, he commits a serious trespass upon the domain and against the rights of his scientific neighbor. Against such blind religious leaders of the blind, especially those among them who ought to have known better, we may use the prophetic word of Jeremiah, speaking in the name of the Lord:

"I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran. I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them. They prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, a thing of nought and the deceit of their heart." (Jer. 23:21; 14:14).

Similarly, the trouble is often caused by men of science advancing a rather crude and

ill considered materialistic and atheistic naturalism, which can never be more than an unverified philosophical theory, as if it were the fully verified conclusion of empirical science. Such "oppositions of science falsely so-called" are probably at the present time at least as serious an obstacle to an understanding between the representatives of science and those of religion as anything that is being said nowadays in the name of religion.

When will it be seen that true science and true religion can never be enemies? They both have an ultimate interest in truth, and when they come to know the truth, the truth will make them free from mutual strife, among other things. The irreconcilable conflict, often supposed to be between science and religion, is really a battle on two fronts, namely that between true science and the superstitions of an out-worn, semi-magical religion, and that between true religion and the negative dogmas of materialistic or positivistic philosophy falsely claiming to be logically involved in the verified results of empirical science. It is high time that someone called a foul against those theological dogmatists who attack science in the supposed interest of religion and those equally dogmatic men of science who seek the destruction of religion as if that were the only way to the full liberation of science. Both have been playing "offside" for a very long time.

The truth is, however, that in many and ever-widening circles conflict has given place to conciliation in the mutual relations of science and religion. Not only has a truce been called; provisions for permanent neutrality and against any future participation in such fruitless warfare have received favorable consideration. A policy generally favored is one whereby it would be agreed that science will never send her armed forces into the territory of religion in return for religion's promise not to attempt to interfere with any of the operations of science within her own domain.

And there are not wanting signs that we are about to pass beyond the stage of mere conciliations, neutrality and compromise, and to enter into the final stage of coöperation between science and religion. True science is

no enemy of true religion, but a friend, if often a friend in disguise, especially at first. Science is one of the great teachers of religion, whose lessons are none the less important because so many of the first lessons must needs be negative. If we would learn what to believe and what to do, we must be ready to learn what not to believe and what not to do.

Herbert Spencer's formula for the reconciliation of science and religion fails to do justice to the theoretical value of religion and thus to the possibility of coöperation between science and religion in the construction of a world view. Even physical science is being led, especially in recent years, to results which have important positive value for religion as well as for science itself. The combination of rationality of form with creativity of process in the constitution of the cosmos suggests to the metaphysically minded scientist a primordial casual principle at once mathematically minded and creative of novelty, and thus one which religion tends to identify with the God of its ultimate dependence and faith. If we may adopt a religious interpretation of scientific discovery as being in some real sense natural revelation of God's truth, it can be said that both in the stage of conflict, when Huxley was contending for evolution against the bishops, and in this stage of the beginning of coöperation, when scientific interpreters of nature seem at times to be outdoing theologians in making contributions to religious metaphysics, the pioneers and spokesmen of science have been conspicuous among the prophets of true religion.

But what is perhaps most important in this theoretical coöperation of science and religion is neither the substitution of new secular scientific knowledge for discredited theological dogma nor even the enrichment and strengthening of a religious view of the world by the introduction of newly discovered supporting considerations. It is rather, if I am not mistaken, what is made possible in the way of exhibiting the scientific truth of certain fundamental religious beliefs and teachings when scientific method is definitely introduced into the field of religious experience itself. "Be-

cause the preacher was wise, he taught the people knowledge," we read in Ecclesiastes. And if the preacher of religion today would be wise, he must give the people scientifically verifiable information with reference to what is dependably experientable, and on what conditions, in the realm of religion itself. The religious teacher must come to be able to speak with scientifically expert authority on what kind of religious adjustment and practice is dependably good for something.

I do not mean to say that all of theoretically reasonable or practically essential religious belief can be reduced to scientific form. I do not think it can. Our religious belief will remain in large part a religious institution, faith, or philosophy, other than fully verified or scientific knowledge. But it may nevertheless be very important, not only theoretically but practically, that we transform as much of our religious thinking into verified religious knowledge as critical thought and religious experience together make possible.

Not only at this particular point, but more generally, the coöperation of religion and science promises to be of the greatest practical importance. Science and religion must coöperate, not only for the construction of a truer and more satisfactory world view; it is perhaps even more important that they coöperate for the construction of a better and more satisfactory world order. Nothing is more important today than the coöperation of science and religion for world salvation. If the world is to be adequately or even tolerably delivered from evil and from impending disaster, there must be a spiritual revolution in multitudes of individual lives, such as can only come in adequate degree through vital ethical religion; and there must also be a radical reconstruction of the social order, industrial, economic, political and international, along ethical and coöperative lines. And as one who is perhaps the world's greatest missionary today has recently said, neither science without religion nor religion without science will save the world; it will take the best efforts of science and religion working together.



Members of the Connecticut College Press Board are regular correspondents for newspapers in Connecticut. They keep the public informed concerning college activities and promote campus enterprises through publicity programs. Left to right: Bernice Parker, '37, Bridgeport; Priscilla Cole, '37, Norwich; Doris Wheeler, '37, Rutherford, N.J.; Nancy Burke, '37, Lowell, Mass.

CLASS DAY

CLASS DAY exercises, one of the most picturesque of the commencement week events at Connecticut College, took place in the Outdoor theatre in the arboretum with a large number of parents and friends of the graduating students and others in attendance.

Ideal weather prevailing, and the foliage and flowers in the arboretum at their loveliest, the setting for the exercises was exceptionally beautiful. The thousand laurel plants which border the steps leading from the entrance to the lake, were in full bloom.

The gift from the graduating class to the college of \$1400 for books for the Palmer library was one of the outstanding features of the occasion. The presentation was made by Elsie Thompson of Rosbank, N. Y., chairman of the class gift committee, to President Katharine Blunt.

The exercises began with a procession in

which the seniors and alumnae took part. The seniors, in caps and gowns, were escorted by an honor guard of juniors wearing white, who carried the traditional laurel chain. The alumnae groups were variously attired with their class colors displayed in many novel fashions.

They descended the aboretum steps and marched to the theatre. Here the first event was the planting of the ivy by Margaret Coulter of New Rochelle, N.Y., student chairman of commencement. The class gift was then presented. Emroy Carlough of Allendale, N.J., president of the senior class, presented the class mascot, bronze plaques for the college entrance gates, bearing the name of the institution and the date of its founding.

An unusual and beautiful feature of the exercises was a presentation of a pre-classic suite by the modern dance group. Choreography was by Miss Elizabeth Hartshorn of

the physical education department and Winifred Valentine, '38, of Shelton. Those taking part in the dances were: Mildred Garnett of Evanston, Ill.; Marion Littlefield of Natick, R.I.; Mary Reynolds of Brooklyn; Jeanette Dawless of Hamden; Winifred Valentine of Shelton; Mary Corrigan of Perry, Ohio; Margaret Aymar of Woodcliffe Lake, N.J.; Ruth Earle of Englewood, N.J.; Katherine Andrus of Bradford; Margaret Ross of Massillon, Ohio; Jane Flannery of Berlin; Lucinda Kirkman of Brooklyn; and Eleanor Robertson of Manchester.

Scenes from Shakespeare's "The Merchant of Venice" were presented by the senior class together with Wig and Candle, the college dramatic club, under the direction of Mrs. Josephine Hunter Ray. The cast for the performance included: Elizabeth Gould, '40, of Albany; Helen Biggs, '40, of Hamden; Ruth Kellogg, '39, of Short Hills, N.J.; Dorothy Haney, '37, of Washington, D.C.; Helen Maxwell, '38, of Pelham Manor, N.Y.; Marian Adams, '37, of St. Louis, Mo.; Elizabeth Taylor, '37, of Bridgeport; Louise Cook, '37, of Westerly, R.I.; Theodora Hobson, '37, of New York City; Cornelia Tillotson, '37, of Boston; Barabara Lawrence, '38, of New London; Jean Sincere, '40, of Highland Park, Ill.; Rose Soukop, '40, of New York City; and Harriet Rice, '40, of New London.

The art committee in charge of the play consisted of Elizabeth Hamblin, '37, of Providence, chairman; Marion Littlefield of Natick, R.I.; Elizabeth Taylor of Bridgeport; Glovett Beckwith-Ewell of West Hartford; and Lucinda Kairkman of Brooklyn, N.Y. The music was arranged by Dorothy Leu, '39, of Wellesley Hills, Mass.

Preceding the class day exercises, the annual luncheon given by the trustees to the members of the graduating class and alumnae, was held in Thames hall. Harrison B. Freeman of Hartford, chairman of the board, presided. Greetings were given the group by Mrs. Janet

Crawford How, president of the alumnae association. President Blunt spoke briefly. Marion Nichols Arnold, representing the class of 1932 which held its fifth reunion, and Lois Penny Stephenson, representing the class of 1927 which held its tenth reunion, were on the speaking program. Miss Agnes Leahy of the class of 1921, who is an alumna trustee, was the principal speaker.

Saturday morning the annual meeting of the alumnae association was held in Fanning hall. Reports of the officers and committee chairmen were submitted. There was no election of officers, the association officers serving for two years in succession.

A feature of the meeting was the description by Kathryn Moss, executive secretary of the association, of the new alumnae relations committee which was created this spring. She said:

"The alumnae relations committee composed of three representatives of the board of trustees, and three alumnae chosen from the alumnae body at large has been formed for the purpose of discussing college affairs and policies in which all alumnae are interested, the size of the college, the admission plan of the college, faculty tenure, faculty and student housing, the academic standards of the college and many other fundamental matters.

"Such a committee marks a new era in college-alumnae relations in that it offers the alumnae an opportunity to be of real help and influence in college education, it indicates that we are entering upon a phase where the alumnae can be of assistance educationally as well as financially to the college."

That evening members of the classes of 1927, 1932, 1934, and 1936 had their reunion banquets.

The seniors in cap and gown gathered at 9:30 for their last sing on the Palmer Library steps. They were led by the college song leader, Doris A. Wheeler, of Rutherford, N.J.

FREED BUT NOT YET FREE*

BY FRANK EDWARD MORRIS

IN THESE troubled and confused days it is a familiar complaint that our world is a chaos. Certainly all is not so well with us as we could wish. But, why shouldn't life today be a chaos? Almost every one of the forces that since the sixteenth century have been shaping us has been a force that in one way or another makes for disintegration.

Secularism is a contemporary force tending to supplant religion. A religious order such as Medievalism brought into partial reality was a unity because in it there was a supreme and integrating set of values that all men acknowledged; but a secular order is inherently a jumble of a thousand different and conflicting interests, each of them dominant in the life of some Tom, Dick, or Harry.

Again, democracy is a force supplanting aristocracy. An aristocratic world is one where the classes owe something to the masses and, *noblesse oblige*, acknowledge the debt, and where the masses give loyalty to their superiors; but democracy as it has so far worked out means little more than a demoralizing scheme of things in which individuals and mobs may scramble for special preference.

Again, nationalism is a force replacing world empire. A world empire is at least a unity; whereas a loose aggregation of some sixty sovereign, proud, and aspiring nationalistic states is a chaos by invitation.

Finally, industry and business are forces today shunting art and thought to the periphery of life. A philosophic and artistic social order, such as Athens at her best represented, is an order where men are too much absorbed in the higher, non-competitive values which all may share to squabble over money or prestige or other merely personal interests; but a business civilization such as we have today, where every man is set against every other in competition for private gain, is reaching out the right hand of fellowship to disaster.

Why shouldn't our world be a chaos? The

motives that for four hundred years have been shaping us are disintegrating ones.

II

It would be false, of course, to assert that we of the twentieth century are not in many ways superior to the Greeks, the Romans, or the men of the Middle Ages. We are stronger and longer-lived; we have immeasurably better living conditions; disease has been conquered to a great extent; suffering of a gross, physical sort has been reduced to a minimum; the slavery of man to man has been in its cruder forms all but eliminated in civilized lands; the hours of daily toil have been shortened and the work lightened; and we have obtained control over natural forces that makes man akin to the miracle-working gods. We all realize that these things are true, but the fact remains that the very forces that have furnished modern men with their purposes and ideals and have absorbed their whole attention have brought disintegration to the social order. Why?

The answer should, it seems, be clear to anyone who is familiar with the development of our Western civilization. Indeed, it stares us in the face. We of the modern world have declared ourselves to be—by grace of the intellectual and spiritual emancipation brought by the Renaissance, the Reformation, and modern science—free and equal human beings each entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And what is wrong with that idea? What connection does it have with the chaos of today? The connection lies in the truth that *freed men are not necessarily free men*. Freedom from church, from state, from a supernatural moral law may mean not a world of coöperative human beings, mature enough to substitute self-discipline for arbitrary external authority; it may mean anti-social individualism, legalized anarchy. It may mean a world where freedom is only selfishness and lawlessness; where men confuse thinking for the truth with thinking for

* Reprinted from *Journal of Adult Education*, April, 1933.

themselves, that is, as they please; where the unadmitted slogan for competitive individuals and competitive nations is "Every man for himself and the Devil take all but our personal friends."

We have attempted to legislate men into righteousness. We have tried to declare men into freedom. We have sought to gain liberty by fighting. But declarations do not make free men, nor do constitutions, nor do wars. Freedom is not a gift. It is not a verbal achievement. It is a hard-won, individual, ethical acquisition. It is conquest of self, victory over ignorance and prejudice and indifference and self-centered emotions. It is more subtle and at the same time far more arduous than traditional morality. Yet both for individual and for social salvation it must be attained, the conquest must be attempted, the victory must be sought. When we begin really to understand this we shall be in a position to make a world and not a chaos. So far we are culturally little better than children, wasting ourselves as nations, and as individuals within nations, in jealous and unenlightened bickering instead of working together for mature ends. Our troubles arise today from the intellectual and spiritual liberation of individuals not prepared for liberty, not willing to assume social responsibility nor seeing what it means, not disciplined to be thoughtful; in short, *not equipped for corporate life in a modern world.*

III

What can be done about our present situation? There is only one thing that can be done about it—we must educate ourselves. It is education that we need; not simply more training to do in the same ways the same things that are now endangering our social order; not teaching or learning blind acceptance of the *status quo* in the name of patriot-

ism or citizenship, or in the spirit of Babbity or pseudo-humility; not the acquisition of an ineffectual culture that repudiates real life; not mere instruction in the game of getting on in the world; not any nor all of these things; but education. We need education that brings enlightenment; an appreciative understanding of our human world; a sobering sense of individual responsibility; a glorious sense of sharing in the corporate life of humanity, past, present, and to come.

Making men fit to be free is one of the chief functions of the school and the college today. There are no rules or formulas for doing this task; it can not be accomplished by tomorrow or next year; but there is sound reason for believing that it can be done. Education working with religion can transform the present race of individuals, now utterly at the mercy of the temporal and the changing, into a race of men with roots in the Eternal. Education working through the home can take fear and greed out of men's souls and replace them with confidence and altruism. Education working through the school and college can temper impulse and caprice and self-love in men and develop in them a discipline of reason that will make possible coöperation and foresight. Education working in the adult world can teach men the superior satisfaction of non-competitive values—the appreciation of beauty, the pursuit of knowledge and understanding, the integration of character, the disinterested service of humanity; it can reveal the illusory qualities of many of the competitive values. *Education, in fine, can make men fit to be free.*

Is this too much to expect of the educative process? It may be. But it is, in any case, what the educator of today is beginning, for the first time, to see clearly as his main task and to plan for. It is the challenge that a chaotic world of individuals, freed but not yet free, presents to education.

THE EDITOR RUMINATES

WELL, this is in a sense a Commencement issue, bearing the admonitions of the wise ones to those who are just starting, the names of those of our Alma Mater chooses to honor, and the reflections of some who steer her course. What, why, and whither Connecticut College? Or words to that effect. It casts us into a reflective mood.

We are reminded of our own state of mind just before the academic tassel was flipped across our heated brow. It was an important moment, provocative of much oration and deep reflection on the fundamental scheme of things. We thought so anyway. We took things seriously in those days. We had a number of things to say about the true

If You Clip This Coupon

We will get more National Advertising, and with the increased revenue we will enlarge, and beautify this magazine. Thank you.

The Editor.

function of a liberal arts college and the intellectual life. It had been our intention to spend four years discovering the vastness of the field before us—four years of good reading, good music, good art, perhaps a bit of creative endeavor. Had we found what we sought? In a loud voice we answered no. We were very bitter about it, ending with the emphatic generalization that many thousand dollars had brought only a dozen or so new friends—and after all one could have made new friends right at home. And a gray-beard smiled benevolently at our ravings and murmured, "Ah, youth, youth!"

Not long back we heard a '37 senior also waxing eloquent over her forthcoming Commencement. Excitedly she avowed that the

My Purchasing Plans for 1937



Unless seriously considering purchasing products or services listed, please don't check. **OUR ADVERTISERS ARE PRINTED IN TYPE LIKE THIS, PLEASE FAVOR IF POSSIBLE.**

For My Home

Refrigerator
☐ **KELVINATOR**
☐ **FRIGIDAIRE**
☐ _____

Other Products

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Washer | <input type="checkbox"/> Coal Stoker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boiler Burner | <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Ironer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Heater |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Piano | <input type="checkbox"/> Oil Burner |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Range | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Conditioning |



I plan to ☐ Build ☐ Buy ☐ Remodel in 1937
☐ Send free booklet on **KELVIN HOME**

For My Future

INSURANCE CAREERS: Check below if interested in entering life insurance salesmanship:

- ☐ On commission basis
☐ On fixed compensation basis

Check here for a copy of the free booklet ☐ **"Insurance Careers for College Graduates."**

FOR MY FUTURE: I am interested in receiving information on:

- ☐ Investment Program for the Future
☐ Retirement Income Plan
☐ Monthly Income for my Family
☐ Educational Insurance for My Children
☐ Inheritance Tax Insurance

Personal Property Insurance

☐ Please send me a free **HOUSEHOLD INVENTORY** Booklet

Automobiles

☐ Under \$800 ☐ \$800-\$1200 ☐ \$1200-\$2000 ☐ Over \$2000

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Buick | <input type="checkbox"/> Dodge | <input type="checkbox"/> Packard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CHEVROLET | <input type="checkbox"/> La Salle | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cadillac | <input type="checkbox"/> OLDSMOBILE | <input type="checkbox"/> Used Cars: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CORD | <input type="checkbox"/> PONTIAC | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> truck | <input type="checkbox"/> trailer |

Accessories

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> GOODRICH TIRES | <input type="checkbox"/> Battery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Tires | <input type="checkbox"/> Auto Heater |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Auto Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Typewriters

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> REMINGTON | { <input type="checkbox"/> Portable
<input type="checkbox"/> Office |
| <input type="checkbox"/> L. C. SMITH-CORONA | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office Equipment: _____ | |



Personal Items

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Electric Razor | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Watch |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Movie Camera | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

COLLEGE _____

CLASS _____

OCCUPATION _____

(3)

Tear out coupon carefully along dotted lines

Please Fill Out Other Side of This Coupon

Then fold for mailing as indicated on reverse side

My Future Plans for 1937

Travel

☐ Europe ☐ SWEDEN ☐ NASSAU

☐ SOUTH AFRICA ☐ Florida ☐ Transcontinental

☐ California ☐ Mexico ☐ Yosemite

I am considering traveling via:

☐ FRENCH LINE ☐ ITALIAN LINE ☐ ATLANTIC COASTLINE R.R.

☐ SOUTHERN PACIFIC R.R. ☐ CHICAGO & N.W. R.R.

Airlines: I Am Considering Using

☐ PAN AMERICAN ☐ AMERICAN AIRLINES

B SLIT HERE **-B**

Private or Professional Schools

Boys

☐ Cranbrook ☐ Franklin & Marshall ☐ George ☐ Hebron ☐ Millford

Northwood ☐ Roxbury ☐ Williston

Girls

☐ St. Anne's ☐ St. Catherine's ☐ Wheeler

Professional

☐ Amer. Academy of Dramatic Arts ☐ Acting, Directing ☐ Teachers' Summer Course ☐ Katharine Gibbs /

--- FOLD BACK ---

GRADUATE GROUP, Inc.

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, N. Y.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY—

BUSINESS REPLY ENVELOPE

No postage stamp necessary if mailed in the United States



--- FOLD BACK ---

Free Style Booklet

☐ "Shoe Styles for Men" (FRANK BROTHERS).

Special Offer

☐ NEWS WEEK—the illustrated News Magazine. Send me the next 20 issues and bill for \$1.00 (half the single copy price). Special offer new subscribers only.

☐ HEALTH RAY SUN LAMP—Send full details of special FREE TRIAL OFFER.

Other Purchasing Plans

Last Year I Bought

AUTOMOBILE _____ DEALER _____ \$ _____

TIRES _____ DEALER _____ \$ _____

INSURANCE _____ AGENT _____ \$ _____

REFRIGERATOR _____ DEALER _____ \$ _____

TYPEWRITER _____ DEALER _____ \$ _____

TRAVEL TO _____ VIA _____ \$ _____

PRIVATE SCHOOL _____ \$ _____

TO MAIL: tear out coupon carefully along dotted lines. Open slit B in top section with knife or sharp pencil.

(A) Please Fill Out Other Side of This Coupon (Copyright 1937 Pat. Applied for)

First CLASS PERMIT No. 11299 Sec. 510 (P.L. & R.) New York, N. Y.

Fold back top section. Fold back bottom section. Insert Feb. A in slit B. Mail without postage.

fostering of the intellectual life is the function of the liberal arts college. She had pursued our own major—following in our footsteps, as it were—and there was a familiar ring to her comments. She submitted that four years of swing music, Alfred Lord Tennyson, and child psychology had little to do with the intellectual life. "Job? Huh! I'll probably have to teach school! You know, you were lucky to have been here before everything went luxurious. You really lived in your dirty old rooms in Brandford. We don't. This is just a country club. You don't find people arguing about religion and music and painting and—Oh, the only thing they ever talk about is sex—sex—sex! You don't know how lucky you were!" So we smiled benevolently and murmured, "Ah, youth, youth!"

But it occurs to us that it's a long time since we've argued about anything in particular. We can't even get decently exercised over the social revolution—past, present, or future. And we are pessimistic. We've even endorsed the rank heresy that the majority of college women are using their talents to best advantage in a country club.

In a week or so we shall go down to the shore where all our former cronies will be gathered. The session will start with delighted shrieks and in all probability end with same. Our topics of conversation will be simple. X is still teaching school. Y is still waiting for Bill. And Z is worried about Junior's crooked teeth. Generally speaking we will have a wonderful time, and the social revolution will be mentioned only in connection with the rising cost of lamp chops. Unless the party is a complete washout we shall certainly get around to *do-you-remembering*—but our memories will be of the sunset or the river or how silly Z looked sitting in the middle of the flower bed. We remember when these reunions were planned. They were to be milestones—a chance for us to get together and compare developments.

Well, Commencement numbers and reunion reflections—colleges and country clubs. Drat that senior anyway! Perhaps it really doesn't matter. After all, the point is that this issue is months late now and this space had to be filled. Ah, youth, youth!



CAROLINE · B · RICE

'31

129 EAST 82ND STREET · NEW YORK

RHINELANDER 4-4113

PHOTOGRAPHY

SCHOOL OF NURSING
OF YALE UNIVERSITY

•
A Profession for the College Woman

The thirty-two months' course, providing an intensive and varied experience through the case study method, leads to the degree of

MASTER OF NURSING

A Bachelor's degree in arts, science or philosophy from a college of approved standing is required for admission.

For catalogue and information address:

THE DEAN, YALE SCHOOL OF
NURSING

New Haven, Connecticut

NATIONAL BANK
OF COMMERCE

—◆—
Connecticut College Administration and Students have banked here since the college was founded.

Alumnæ have always found it highly satisfactory to continue undergraduate accounts with us. We welcome new accounts.

—◆—
STATE STREET
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT

*Your cigarette line
reads...
They Satisfy*

*And there's a wealth of
good taste in store for you*

Copyright 1937, LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.